

The following tables provide detailed statistical results from Tables 4-7 within “Parallel Distributed Networks Dissociate Episodic and Social Functions Within the Individual” by DiNicola LM, Braga RM and Buckner RL (2020).

Details of Table 4 – Behavioral performance across tasks.

	Sub	PAST SELF vs. PRESENT SELF	FUTURE SELF vs. PRESENT SELF	FALSE BELIEF vs. FALSE PHOTO	EMO. PAIN vs. PHYS. PAIN
Exp. 1	S1	$t(23) = 0.98; p = 0.34$	$t(23) = 1.57; p = 0.13$	$t(18) = -0.59; p = 0.56$	$t(19) = -0.11; p = 0.92$
	S2	$t(23) = 1.10; p = 0.28$	$t(23) = 0.35; p = 0.73$	$t(19) = -0.65; p = 0.52$	$t(19) = 0.14; p = 0.89$
	S3	$t(23) = 1.04; p = 0.31$	$t(23) = 0.90; p = 0.38$	$t(18) = -0.86; p = 0.40$	$t(19) = 3.15; p = 0.01^* EP$
	S4	$t(23) = 0.11; p = 0.91$	$t(23) = 0.01; p = 1.00$	$t(18) = -0.69; p = 0.50$	$t(19) = 0.73; p = 0.48$
	S5	$t(23) = 4.03; p = 0.00^* PAST$	$t(22) = 2.32; p = 0.03^* FUT$	$t(19) = -1.94; p = 0.07$	$t(14) = -0.19; p = 0.85$
	S6	$t(17) = 0.22; p = 0.83$	$t(17) = 1.36; p = 0.19$	$t(18) = -2.48; p = 0.02^* FP$	$t(19) = 0.66; p = 0.52$
Exp. 2	S7	$t(29) = 0.47; p = 0.64$	$t(29) = 2.45; p = 0.02^* FUT$	$t(18) = -1.71; p = 0.10$	$t(18) = -1.62; p = 0.12$
	S8	$t(29) = 0.62; p = 0.54$	$t(29) = 2.53; p = 0.02^* FUT$	$t(19) = -0.36; p = 0.72$	$t(19) = -0.34; p = 0.74$
	S9	$t(19) = 0.32; p = 0.75$	$t(19) = 0.68; p = 0.51$	$t(13) = -0.84; p = 0.41$	$t(14) = -0.65; p = 0.53$
	S10	$t(29) = -0.67; p = 0.51$	$t(29) = 0.07; p = 0.95$	$t(17) = -0.46; p = 0.65$	$t(19) = 1.57; p = 0.13$
	S11	$t(29) = 0.25; p = 0.81$	$t(29) = 0.48; p = 0.64$	$t(12) = -0.04; p = 0.97$	$t(14) = 0.15; p = 0.88$
	S12	$t(29) = -0.53; p = 0.60$	$t(29) = 0.54; p = 0.59$	$t(19) = -0.79; p = 0.44$	$t(14) = -1.81; p = 0.09$
Exp. 3	S13	$t(19) = 1.19; p = 0.25$	$t(19) = 0.34; p = 0.74$	$t(14) = 0.78; p = 0.45$	$t(14) = 0.44; p = 0.67$
	S14	$t(29) = -0.34; p = 0.74$	$t(29) = -0.83; p = 0.41$	$t(19) = -2.18; p = 0.04^* FP$	$t(19) = 1.54; p = 0.14$
	S15	$t(29) = -0.38; p = 0.71$	$t(29) = 0.38; p = 0.70$	$t(19) = -1.63; p = 0.12$	$t(19) = 0.81; p = 0.43$
	S16	$t(19) = 1.08; p = 0.29$	$t(19) = 1.46; p = 0.16$	$t(9) = 0.04; p = 0.97$	$t(14) = -0.11; p = 0.91$
	S17	$t(29) = 1.14; p = 0.26$	$t(29) = 2.24; p = 0.03^* FUT$	$t(19) = 0.77; p = 0.45$	$t(19) = 0.66; p = 0.51$
	S18	$t(29) = 1.00; p = 0.33$	$t(29) = 1.14; p = 0.26$	$t(17) = -0.04; p = 0.97$	$t(19) = 0.89; p = 0.38$

Notes: Each cell contains the results of a paired t-test for differences in mean response time (RT) within the contrast of interest. Contrasts featuring a significant difference are marked with a * and labelled with the condition that showed the slower RT (PAST = PAST SELF; FUT = FUTURE SELF; FP = FALSE PHOTO; EP = EMO PAIN). Within an experiment, fewer degrees of freedom resulted from skipped trials. In addition, S6 had one run of the Episodic Projection task excluded; S5, S11 and S12 each had one run of the Other Pain task excluded; S9 and S13 discontinued participation after two sessions, and behavioral data were not recorded for one of S16’s sessions, all resulting in fewer trials in relevant contrasts.

Details of Table 5 – Behavioral performance relevant to exploratory analyses of the expanded Episodic Projection paradigm acquired in Exp. 2 and Exp. 3.

	Sub	PAST SELF vs. PAST NON-SELF	PRESENT SELF vs. PRESENT NON-SELF	FUTURE SELF vs. FUTURE NON-SELF
Exp. 2	S7	$t(29) = -3.02; p = 0.01^* \text{ NS}$	$t(29) = -4.29; p = 0.00^* \text{ NS}$	$t(29) = -0.58; p = 0.57$
	S8	$t(29) = -2.81; p = 0.01^* \text{ NS}$	$t(29) = -5.78; p = 0.00^* \text{ NS}$	$t(29) = -1.06; p = 0.30$
	S9	$t(19) = 1.32; p = 0.20$	$t(19) = -1.09; p = 0.29$	$t(19) = 0.96; p = 0.35$
	S10	$t(28) = -3.69; p = 0.00^* \text{ NS}$	$t(29) = -2.36; p = 0.03^* \text{ NS}$	$t(29) = -0.23; p = 0.82$
	S11	$t(29) = -0.35; p = 0.73$	$t(29) = -2.10; p = 0.04^* \text{ NS}$	$t(29) = -2.83; p = 0.01^* \text{ NS}$
	S12	$t(29) = -3.01; p = 0.01^* \text{ NS}$	$t(29) = -0.88; p = 0.39$	$t(29) = -2.26; p = 0.03^* \text{ NS}$
Exp. 3	S13	$t(19) = 2.59; p = 0.02^* \text{ S}$	$t(19) = -0.99; p = 0.34$	$t(19) = 0.23; p = 0.82$
	S14	$t(29) = -2.18; p = 0.04^* \text{ NS}$	$t(29) = -1.09; p = 0.28$	$t(29) = -2.56; p = 0.02^* \text{ NS}$
	S15	$t(29) = -4.58; p = 0.00^* \text{ NS}$	$t(29) = -4.92; p = 0.00^* \text{ NS}$	$t(29) = -3.94; p = 0.00^* \text{ NS}$
	S16	$t(19) = -0.08; p = 0.94$	$t(19) = -4.53; p = 0.00^* \text{ NS}$	$t(19) = -1.78; p = 0.09$
	S17	$t(29) = -3.77; p = 0.00^* \text{ NS}$	$t(29) = -4.90; p = 0.00^* \text{ NS}$	$t(29) = -2.40; p = 0.02^* \text{ NS}$
	S18	$t(29) = 0.28; p = 0.78$	$t(29) = -1.94; p = 0.06$	$t(29) = -0.89; p = 0.38$

Notes: Each cell contains the results of a paired t-test for differences in mean RT within the contrast of interest. Contrasts featuring a significant difference are marked with a * and labelled with the condition that showed the slower RT (either SELF (S) or NON-SELF (NS) in each contrast). Within an experiment, fewer degrees of freedom typically resulted from skipped trials. In addition, S9 and S13 discontinued participation after two sessions, and behavioral data were not recorded for one of S16's sessions, resulting in fewer trials in relevant contrasts.

Details of Table 6: Composite Column – Results from Exp. 2 whole-brain trial-level analyses of task and null data.

	Sub	Network x Domain Interaction		Network A Planned t-Test		Network B Planned t-Test	
		<i>F-value</i>	<i>p-value</i>	<i>t-value</i>	<i>p-value</i>	<i>t-value</i>	<i>p-value</i>
Task Data	S7	38.38	0.00 ++	3.74	0.00 ++	5.54	0.00 ++
	S8	14.14	0.00 ++	3.08	0.00 ++	2.58	0.01 ++
	S9	5.85	0.02 ++	1.93	0.03 ++	1.69	0.05 ++
	S10	0.23	0.63 -	-	-	-	-
	S11	7.46	0.01 ++	3.62	0.00 ++	0.38	0.35 -
	S12	23.54	0.00 ++	3.48	0.00 ++	3.88	0.00 ++
Null Data	S7	0.01	0.93 -	-	-	-	-
	S8	3.26	0.07 +	-	-	-	-
	S9	0.01	0.91 -	-	-	-	-
	S10	0.35	0.55 -	-	-	-	-
	S11	0.08	0.78 -	-	-	-	-
	S12	0.12	0.73 -	-	-	-	-

Notes: In bold, *F*-values and corresponding *p*-values are shown for the interaction effects calculated, for each subject, between the networks and task domains, using factorial ANOVA (with Type-II SS). Additional columns display the *t*-values and corresponding *p*-values for one-tailed *t*-tests conducted as planned comparisons (Episodic Projection > ToM within Network A and ToM > Episodic Projection within Network B), for individuals showing significant interaction effects. Significant results are marked as they are in Table 6 (++ $p < 0.5$, + $p < 0.1$, - $p \geq 0.1$).

Details of Table 6: Region Columns – Results from the Exp. 2 region-specific trial-level analyses of task data.

	Sub	Region	Network x Domain Interaction		Network A Planned t-Test		Network B Planned t-Test	
			<i>F-value</i>	<i>p-value</i>	<i>t-value</i>	<i>p-value</i>	<i>t-value</i>	<i>p-value</i>
Task Data	S7	PFC	23.64	0.00 ++	4.60	0.00 ++	3.24	0.00 ++
		PPC	20.64	0.00 ++	1.83	0.04 ++	5.34	0.00 ++
		LTC	18.42	0.00 ++	-0.36	0.64 -	6.68	0.00 ++
		PMC	29.97	0.00 ++	3.64	0.00 ++	4.72	0.00 ++
		MPFC	12.57	0.00 ++	2.63	0.01 ++	2.96	0.00 ++
	S8	PFC	11.62	0.00 ++	4.31	0.00 ++	1.02	0.16 -
		PPC	2.26	0.13 -	-	-	-	-
		LTC	2.37	0.13 -	-	-	-	-
		PMC	7.23	0.01 ++	3.34	0.00 ++	1.15	0.13 -
		MPFC	9.41	0.00 ++	1.55	0.06 +	2.93	0.00 ++
	S9	PFC	6.11	0.01 ++	2.28	0.01 ++	1.47	0.07 +
		PPC	1.51	0.22 -	-	-	-	-
		LTC	5.55	0.02 ++	2.32	0.01 ++	1.18	0.12 -
		PMC	1.85	0.18 -	-	-	-	-
		MPFC	8.86	0.00 ++	4.39	0.00 ++	-0.11	0.54 -
	S10	PFC	0.07	0.79 -	-	-	-	-
		PPC	0.28	0.60 -	-	-	-	-
		LTC	2.77	0.10 +	-	-	-	-
		PMC	0.14	0.71 -	-	-	-	-
		MPFC	3.13	0.08 +	-	-	-	-
	S11	PFC	6.45	0.01 ++	4.67	0.00 ++	-1.51	0.93 -
		PPC	2.23	0.14 -	-	-	-	-
		LTC	2.82	0.10 +	-	-	-	-
		PMC	7.69	0.01 ++	3.00	0.00 ++	1.41	0.08 +
MPFC		8.92	0.00 ++	4.13	0.00 ++	0.35	0.36 -	
S12	PFC	5.25	0.02 ++	1.02	0.16 -	2.48	0.01 ++	
	PPC	18.62	0.00 ++	3.43	0.00 ++	3.14	0.00 ++	
	LTC	0.26	0.61 -	-	-	-	-	
	PMC	18.31	0.00 ++	2.58	0.01 ++	3.66	0.00 ++	
	MPFC	40.87	0.00 ++	5.03	0.00 ++	4.76	0.00 ++	

Notes: In bold, *F*-values and corresponding *p*-values are shown for the interaction effects calculated, within 5 regions for each subject’s task data, between the networks and task domains, using factorial ANOVA (with Type-II SS). Additional columns display the *t*-values and corresponding *p*-values for one-tailed *t*-tests conducted as planned comparisons (Episodic Projection > ToM within Network A and ToM > Episodic Projection within Network B), for regions showing significant interaction effects. Significant results are marked as they are in Table 6 (++ $p < 0.5$, + $p < 0.1$, - $p \geq 0.1$).

Details of Table 6: Region Columns – Results from the Exp. 2 region-specific trial-level analyses of null data.

	Sub	Region	Network x Domain Interaction			Network A Planned t-Test		Network B Planned t-Test			
			<i>F-value</i>	<i>p-value</i>		<i>t-value</i>	<i>p-value</i>	<i>t-value</i>	<i>p-value</i>		
Null Data	S7	PFC	0.04	0.85	-	-	-	-	-		
		PPC	0.04	0.84	-	-	-	-	-		
		LTC	0.02	0.90	-	-	-	-	-		
		PMC	0.00	0.98	-	-	-	-	-		
		MPFC	0.02	0.90	-	-	-	-	-		
	S8	PFC	0.73	0.39	-	-	-	-	-		
		PPC	5.56	0.02	++	2.62	0.01	++	0.88	0.19	-
		LTC	2.01	0.16	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		PMC	2.58	0.11	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		MPFC	0.37	0.54	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	S9	PFC	0.13	0.72	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		PPC	0.06	0.81	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		LTC	0.26	0.61	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		PMC	0.33	0.56	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		MPFC	0.07	0.80	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	S10	PFC	0.93	0.34	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		PPC	0.35	0.56	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		LTC	0.39	0.54	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		PMC	0.00	0.96	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		MPFC	0.05	0.82	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	S11	PFC	0.11	0.74	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		PPC	1.03	0.31	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		LTC	0.44	0.51	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		PMC	0.05	0.82	-	-	-	-	-	-	
MPFC		0.03	0.87	-	-	-	-	-	-		
S12	PFC	0.01	0.90	-	-	-	-	-	-		
	PPC	0.07	0.79	-	-	-	-	-	-		
	LTC	0.06	0.80	-	-	-	-	-	-		
	PMC	0.02	0.88	-	-	-	-	-	-		
	MPFC	0.72	0.40	-	-	-	-	-	-		

Notes: In bold, *F*-values and corresponding *p*-values are shown for the interaction effects calculated, within 5 regions for each subject's null data, between the networks and task domains, using factorial ANOVA (with Type-II SS). Additional columns display the *t*-values and corresponding *p*-values for one-tailed *t*-tests conducted as planned comparisons (Episodic Projection > ToM within Network A and ToM > Episodic Projection within Network B), for regions showing significant interaction effects. Significant results are marked as they are in Table 6 (++ $p < 0.05$, + $p < 0.1$, - $p > 0.1$).

Details of Table 7: Composite Column – Results from the Exp. 3 whole-brain trial-level analyses of task and null data.

	Sub	Network x Domain Interaction		Network A Planned t-Test		Network B Planned t-Test	
		<i>F-value</i>	<i>p-value</i>	<i>t-value</i>	<i>p-value</i>	<i>t-value</i>	<i>p-value</i>
Task Data	S13	17.53	0.00 ++	3.47	0.00 ++	2.66	0.00 ++
	S14	7.38	0.01 ++	1.05	0.15 -	2.84	0.00 ++
	S15	0.83	0.36 -	-	-	-	-
	S16	25.48	0.00 ++	1.42	0.08 +	5.36	0.00 ++
	S17	43.22	0.00 ++	6.56	0.00 ++	3.44	0.00 ++
	S18	9.75	0.00 ++	1.86	0.03 ++	2.93	0.00 ++
Null Data	S13	0.48	0.49 -	-	-	-	-
	S14	0.14	0.71 -	-	-	-	-
	S15	0.04	0.85 -	-	-	-	-
	S16	0.24	0.62 -	-	-	-	-
	S17	0.83	0.36 -	-	-	-	-
	S18	0.00	0.96 -	-	-	-	-

Notes: In bold, *F*-values and corresponding *p*-values are shown for the interaction effects calculated, for each subject, between the networks and task domains, using factorial ANOVA (with Type-II SS). Additional columns display the *t*-values and corresponding *p*-values for one-tailed *t*-tests conducted as planned comparisons (Episodic Projection > ToM within Network A and ToM > Episodic Projection within Network B), for individuals showing significant interaction effects. Significant results are marked as they are in Table 7 (++ $p < 0.5$, + $p < 0.1$, - $p > 0.1$).

Details of Table 7: Region Columns – Results from the Exp. 3 region-specific trial-level analyses of task data.

	Sub	Region	Network x Domain Interaction		Network A Planned t-Test		Network B Planned t-Test	
			<i>F-value</i>	<i>p-value</i>	<i>t-value</i>	<i>p-value</i>	<i>t-value</i>	<i>p-value</i>
Task Data	S13	PFC	12.73	0.00 ++	2.99	0.00 ++	2.27	0.01 ++
		PPC	11.55	0.00 ++	2.52	0.01 ++	2.50	0.01 ++
		LTC	2.92	0.09 +	-	-	-	-
		PMC	14.96	0.00 ++	3.82	0.00 ++	2.14	0.02 ++
		MPFC	8.91	0.00 ++	2.97	0.00 ++	1.54	0.06 +
	S14	PFC	2.85	0.09 +	2.39	0.01 ++	0.15	0.44 -
		PPC	4.18	0.04 ++	0.28	0.39 -	2.83	0.00 ++
		LTC	1.52	0.22 -	-	-	-	-
		PMC	8.31	0.00 ++	2.28	0.01 ++	2.12	0.02 ++
		MPFC	12.71	0.00 ++	1.72	0.04 ++	3.46	0.00 ++
	S15	PFC	0.66	0.42 -	-	-	-	-
		PPC	0.03	0.86 -	-	-	-	-
		LTC	0.43	0.51 -	-	-	-	-
		PMC	2.58	0.11 -	-	-	-	-
		MPFC	4.00	0.05 ++	0.73	0.23 -	2.13	0.02 ++
	S16	PFC	13.80	0.00 ++	0.90	0.18 -	4.21	0.00 ++
		PPC	21.71	0.00 ++	2.71	0.00 ++	4.13	0.00 ++
		LTC	0.51	0.47 -	-	-	-	-
		PMC	19.36	0.00 ++	1.40	0.08 +	4.79	0.00 ++
		MPFC	17.55	0.00 ++	-0.44	0.67 -	5.22	0.00 ++
S17	PFC	33.36	0.00 ++	6.39	0.00 ++	2.87	0.00 ++	
	PPC	43.82	0.00 ++	4.98	0.00 ++	5.04	0.00 ++	
	LTC	10.25	0.00 ++	0.11	0.46 -	4.13	0.00 ++	
	PMC	31.96	0.00 ++	6.33	0.00 ++	2.02	0.02 ++	
	MPFC	33.22	0.00 ++	7.94	0.00 ++	2.03	0.02 ++	
S18	PFC	6.77	0.01 ++	2.69	0.00 ++	1.20	0.12 -	
	PPC	7.39	0.01 ++	1.14	0.13 -	3.29	0.00 ++	
	LTC	0.04	0.84 -	-	-	-	-	
	PMC	11.25	0.00 ++	2.16	0.02 ++	2.93	0.00 ++	
	MPFC	5.74	0.02 ++	3.15	0.00 ++	-0.04	0.52 -	

Notes: In bold, *F*-values and corresponding *p*-values are shown for the interaction effects calculated, within 5 regions for each subject’s task data, between the networks and task domains, using factorial ANOVA (with Type-II SS). Additional columns display the *t*-values and corresponding *p*-values for one-tailed *t*-tests conducted as planned comparisons (Episodic Projection > ToM within Network A and ToM > Episodic Projection within Network B), for regions showing significant interaction effects. Significant results are marked as they are in Table 7 (++ $p < 0.5$, + $p < 0.1$, - $p > 0.1$).

Details of Table 7: Region Columns – Results from the Exp. 3 region-specific trial-level analyses of null data.

	Sub	Region	Network x Domain Interaction			Network A Planned t-Test		Network B Planned t-Test	
			<i>F-value</i>	<i>p-value</i>		<i>t-value</i>	<i>p-value</i>	<i>t-value</i>	<i>p-value</i>
Null Data	S13	PFC	0.09	0.76	-	-	-	-	-
		PPC	0.00	0.97	-	-	-	-	-
		LTC	0.02	0.89	-	-	-	-	-
		PMC	0.45	0.50	-	-	-	-	-
		MPFC	0.56	0.45	-	-	-	-	-
	S14	PFC	0.22	0.64	-	-	-	-	-
		PPC	0.00	0.98	-	-	-	-	-
		LTC	0.17	0.68	-	-	-	-	-
		PMC	0.58	0.45	-	-	-	-	-
		MPFC	0.30	0.58	-	-	-	-	-
	S15	PFC	0.02	0.88	-	-	-	-	-
		PPC	0.01	0.94	-	-	-	-	-
		LTC	0.23	0.63	-	-	-	-	-
		PMC	1.16	0.28	-	-	-	-	-
		MPFC	0.00	0.95	-	-	-	-	-
	S16	PFC	0.20	0.65	-	-	-	-	-
		PPC	0.11	0.74	-	-	-	-	-
		LTC	0.53	0.47	-	-	-	-	-
		PMC	0.06	0.80	-	-	-	-	-
		MPFC	0.06	0.81	-	-	-	-	-
	S17	PFC	0.34	0.56	-	-	-	-	-
		PPC	0.13	0.72	-	-	-	-	-
		LTC	3.03	0.08	+	-	-	-	-
		PMC	0.18	0.68	-	-	-	-	-
		MPFC	0.82	0.37	-	-	-	-	-
S18	PFC	0.00	0.95	-	-	-	-	-	
	PPC	0.01	0.90	-	-	-	-	-	
	LTC	0.00	0.98	-	-	-	-	-	
	PMC	0.11	0.75	-	-	-	-	-	
	MPFC	0.00	0.96	-	-	-	-	-	

Notes: In bold, *F*-values and corresponding *p*-values are shown for the interaction effects calculated, within 5 regions for each subject's null data, between the networks and task domains, using factorial ANOVA (with Type-II SS). Additional columns display the *t*-values and corresponding *p*-values for one-tailed *t*-tests conducted as planned comparisons (Episodic Projection > ToM within Network A and ToM > Episodic Projection within Network B), for regions showing significant interaction effects. Significant results are marked as they are in Table 7 (++ $p < 0.5$, + $p < 0.1$, - $p > 0.1$).